

MAY 14 1987

ROBERT F. SPANOL, JR.  
CLERK

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

OCTOBER TERM, 1986

STATE OF NEBRASKA,

*Plaintiff*

v.

STATE OF WYOMING,

*Defendant*

REPLY OF  
NEBRASKA PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT AND  
THE CENTRAL NEBRASKA PUBLIC POWER AND  
IRRIGATION DISTRICT TO WYOMING MEMORANDUM  
IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
A JOINT COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION AND  
FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE AS PLAINTIFFS

*Of Counsel:*


GENE D. WATSON  
JOHN C. MCCLURE  
Nebraska Public Power District  
1414 15th Street  
Columbus, Nebraska 68601  
(402) 563-5773

BRUCE A. PETERSON  
ANDERSON, STRASBURGER, KLEIN,  
PETERSON AND SWAN  
The Central Nebraska Public  
Power and Irrigation District  
4th & Lincoln Streets  
Holdrege, Nebraska 68949  
(308) 995-8601

May 14, 1987

TOM WATSON  
(Counsel of Record)  
JEFFREY J. DAVIDSON  
MARK A. WARNQUIST  
CROWELL & MORING  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 624-2500

*Attorneys for*  
*Intervenors/Plaintiffs*  
Nebraska Public Power District  
The Central Nebraska Public  
Power and Irrigation District



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	i
ARGUMENT .....	2
I. THE "REAL PURPOSE" OF THE DISTRICTS' INTERVENTION MOTION IS TO PROTECT THE DISTRICTS' PROPERTY, REVENUE, AND FEDERAL LICENSE INTERESTS IN FERC PROJECTS 1417 AND 1835 IF BIG BEND REACH INSTREAM FLOW ISSUES ARE CONSIDERED, NOT SIMPLY TO OPPOSE INTERVENTION BY THE TRUST AND AUDUBON.....	2
II. THE STATE OF NEBRASKA CANNOT ADEQUATELY REPRESENT THE DISTRICTS' INTERESTS IN THIS ACTION BECAUSE THE STATE DOES NOT HAVE THE DISTRICTS' FEDERAL LICENSE OBLIGATIONS OR PROJECT OPERATION EXPERIENCE .....	3
CONCLUSION.....	5

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### *Cases*

<i>Mo-Kan Pipeline Co. v. United States</i> , 312 U.S. 502 (1941) .....	5
<i>New Jersey v. New York</i> , 345 U.S. 369 .....	4



IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

OCTOBER TERM, 1986

---

No. 108, Original

---

STATE OF NEBRASKA,

v.

*Plaintiff*

STATE OF WYOMING,

*Defendant*

---

**REPLY OF  
NEBRASKA PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT AND  
THE CENTRAL NEBRASKA PUBLIC POWER AND  
IRRIGATION DISTRICT TO WYOMING MEMORANDUM  
IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
A JOINT COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION AND  
FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE AS PLAINTIFFS**

---

Wyoming misconstrues the intervention motion filed by Nebraska Public Power District and The Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District (the "Districts"). The Districts have not "nominally" moved to intervene, nor is there anything "nominal" about the Districts' interest in this action. See Wyoming Memorandum in Opposition to Intervention at 1. The Districts have a direct and compelling interest in the Big Bend Reach "instream flow" claims that are before the Court. If instream flows claims in the Big Bend Reach of the Platte River are to be considered in this action, the Districts must intervene to protect their interests associated with Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") Projects 1417 and 1835.

The Districts note that no other party or potential intervenor party to this action has opposed the Districts' motion for intervention.

## ARGUMENT

### **I. THE "REAL PURPOSE" OF THE DISTRICTS' INTERVENTION MOTION IS TO PROTECT THE DISTRICTS' PROPERTY, REVENUE, AND FEDERAL LICENSE INTERESTS IN FERC PROJECTS 1417 AND 1835 IF BIG BEND REACH INSTREAM FLOW ISSUES ARE CONSIDERED, NOT SIMPLY TO OPPOSE INTERVENTION BY THE TRUST AND AUDUBON**

Wyoming's response to the Districts' motion consists basically of characterizing it as "nominal" because the Districts agree that this action is properly limited to the claims raised by the State of Nebraska. The "real purpose" of the Districts' intervention motion is to protect the Districts' property, revenue, and federal license interests in Projects 1417 and 1835 because

- The Districts' property is directly implicated by the instream flow claims that were raised by the Platte River Whooping Crane Habitat Maintenance Trust ("Trust") and the National Audubon Society ("Audubon").
- The Platte River System regulation sought in this action by the Trust and Audubon would have a direct and substantial, if not severe, adverse impact on the operations of Projects 1417 and 1835.
- Such Project operation modifications would adversely affect the Districts' revenues.
- The Districts have license obligations as FERC licensees for Projects 1417 and 1835 which are separate and apart from instream flow claims.

Wyoming's response does not offer either factual or legal argument to dispute the Districts' position. Indeed,

Wyoming fails to mention that in its earlier pleadings it told the Court that if the Audubon's and Trust's Big Bend Reach instream flow issues are to be considered,

[e]quity also would require the Court to consider whether operation of diversion and storage projects in Nebraska, such as Lake McConaughy (Kingsley Dam) [Project 1417] should be modified to assure delivery of regulated flows for migratory bird habitat.

Wyoming Memorandum in Opposition to Platte River Trust and Audubon Motions for Leave to Intervene, at 5-6.

Wyoming wants the Court to consider modification of the Districts' Project operations when and if Big Bend Reach instream flow issues are considered, but does not want the Districts to be parties to that consideration. Such a result would be patently unfair to the Districts and wholly unsupported by the principles which guide intervention decisions. Moreover, denying intervention to the Districts would deprive the Court of the Districts' experience and expertise with respect to the operation of the very Projects Wyoming states that the Court would have to consider.

## **II. THE STATE OF NEBRASKA CANNOT ADEQUATELY REPRESENT THE DISTRICTS' INTERESTS IN THIS ACTION BECAUSE THE STATE DOES NOT HAVE THE DISTRICTS' FEDERAL LICENSE OBLIGATIONS OR PROJECT OPERATION EXPERIENCE**

Wyoming offers no basis for its bald assertion that the State of Nebraska will adequately represent the Districts' interests *parens patriae*. Wyoming Memorandum in Opposition to the Districts' Intervention at 2-3.

The instream flow claims raised by the Trust and Audubon have a direct and substantial impact on the operations of the Districts' Projects 1417 and 1835. Wyoming already has stated

[b]ecause of its location between the Wyoming-Nebraska State line and the habitat area, no "regulated flows" delivered at the state line from Wyoming could reach the habitat area without passing through Lake McConaughy (1.9 million acre feet). (Emphasis added.)

Wyoming Memorandum in Opposition to Platte River Trust and National Audubon Society Motion for Leave to Intervene at 6, n. 4. In other words, Wyoming recognizes that the instream flow regulation sought by the Trust and Audubon amounts to a *de facto* regulation of the Districts' Projects.

In *New Jersey v. New York*, 345 U.S. 369, 373 (1953), this Court recognized that the *parens patriae* doctrine does not apply where a party has "some compelling interest in his own right, apart from his interest in a class with all citizens and creatures of the State, which interest is not properly represented by the State." The Districts have a compelling interest in the operation and regulation of their Projects. The Districts have a compelling interest in the revenues derived from Project operations. The Districts have a compelling interest in fulfilling their federal licensee obligations to operate the Projects in accordance with their licenses. These interests are unique with respect to the interests of other Nebraska water users and citizens.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Wyoming contends that the Court's denial in 1935 of the intervention request filed by the Platte Valley Public Power and Irrigation District ("Platte Valley") should govern the Districts' intervention request in this action. Wyoming Memorandum in Opposition to the Districts' Intervention at 4-5. Wyoming's position is inconsistent. The Court's 1935 decision regarding Nebraska Public Power District's predecessor in interest, Platte Valley, is dispositive only if the legal and factual issues before the Court in 1935 are the same issues currently before the Court. But Wyoming agrees that the Big Bend Reach instream flow issues are new and different issues than the issues before the Court in 1935. Wyoming Memorandum in Opposition to Districts' Intervention at 3. If the issues are different, (and Wyoming agrees that they are), the 1935 decision



The Districts recognize Wyoming's strong interest in confining the issues in this action to matters that actually are in dispute between Nebraska and Wyoming. The Districts do not disagree with Wyoming on this point. But, if Big Bend Reach instream flow issues nonetheless are to be considered in this action, the Districts must be participants. The Districts' interests in the Big Bend Reach instream flow issues could not be represented adequately by any of the existing parties. If the Court decides to address the Big Bend instream flow claims raised by the Trust and Audubon, the Districts should be permitted to speak for themselves and to protect their own interests.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and the reasons set forth in the Districts' Brief in Support of Intervention, Wyoming's opposition to the Districts' intervention should be rejected and the Districts should be granted leave to intervene if the Court decides to consider instream flow issues for the Big Bend Reach of the Platte River.

Respectfully submitted,

*Of Counsel:*

GENE D. WATSON  
JOHN C. MCCLURE  
Nebraska Public Power District  
1414 15th Street  
Columbus, Nebraska 68601  
(402) 563-5773

BRUCE A. PETERSON  
ANDERSON, STRASBURGER, KLEIN,  
PETERSON AND SWAN  
The Central Nebraska Public  
Power and Irrigation District  
4th & Lincoln Streets  
Holdrege, Nebraska 68949  
(308) 995-8601

May 14, 1987

TOM WATSON  
(Counsel of Record)  
JEFFREY J. DAVIDSON  
MARK A. WARNQUIST  
CROWELL & MORING  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 624-2500  
*Attorneys for*  
*Intervenors/Plaintiffs*  
Nebraska Public Power District  
The Central Nebraska Public  
Power and Irrigation District

---

is not relevant to the Court's current consideration of the Districts' intervention motion. *See, e.g., Mo-Kan Pipeline Co. v. United States*, 312 U.S. 502 (1941).